

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT TACOMA

8 BRYAN LEE STETSON,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF
12 CORRECTIONS, et al.,

13 Defendants.

14 CASE NO. C15-5524 BHS

15 ORDER ADOPTING REPORT
16 AND RECOMMENDATION

17 This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”)
18 of the Honorable Karen L. Strombom, United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. 26), and
19 Plaintiff Bryan Stetson’s (“Stetson”) filings (Dkts. 27, 28).

20 On September 16, 2015, Stetson filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint against
21 Defendants Washington State Department of Corrections, Bernard Warner, and Kathryn
22 Bruner (“Defendants”). Dkt. 8. Stetson is currently incarcerated at the Stafford Creek
23 Corrections Center (“SCCC”). *Id.* ¶ 3. On October 29, 2015, Stetson moved for a
24 preliminary injunction. Dkt. 19. Stetson seeks to prevent Defendants from transferring
25 him to another facility so that he may continue using the SCCC law library to litigate this

1 case. *Id.* Stetson was not scheduled to be transferred, a transfer hold was in effect
2 through December 31, 2015, and Stetson could obtain an extension of that hold by
3 working with his SCCC Counselor, Jodie Wright (“Wright”). Dkt. 26 at 2–3. On
4 November 24, 2015, Judge Strombom issued the R&R recommending the Court deny
5 Stetson’s motion. *Id.* at 1.

6 On December 23, 2015, Stetson filed a copy of his letter to Wright requesting an
7 institutional hold to use the law library past December 31, 2015. Dkt. 27. On December
8 31, 2015, Stetson filed a copy of Wright’s response to his kite. Dkt. 28. Wright’s
9 response confirms that Stetson has a hold to use the law library until July 30, 2016. *Id.* at
10 2.

11 The Court has reviewed Stetson’s filings, and it appears the filings resolve
12 Stetson’s request for a preliminary injunction. Even if the Court were to construe
13 Stetson’s filings as objections to the R&R, nothing in his filings demonstrates that Judge
14 Strombom’s recommendation is in error. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Therefore, the
15 Court having considered the R&R, Stetson’s filings, and the remaining record, does
16 hereby find and order as follows:

17 (1) The R&R is **ADOPTED**; and
18 (2) Stetson’s motion for preliminary injunction (Dkt. 19) is **DENIED**.

19 Dated this 11th day of January, 2016.

20
21
22



BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge